

COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

Board of Education Agenda



Date of Meeting: May 25, 2005 **Time:** As Shown

Location: Conference Rooms D & E, James Monroe State Office Building
101 North 14th Street, Richmond, Virginia

9:00 a.m. FULL BOARD CONVENES

Moment of Silence

Pledge of Allegiance

Approval of Minutes of the April 20-21, 2005, Meeting of the Board

Public Comment

Action/Discussion Items

- A. First Review of a Request for Approval of an Innovative Program Involving Opening Prior to Labor Day from Alexandria City School Board
- B. First Review of a Recommendation to Approve a Teacher Education Program at Christopher Newport University
- C. First Review of Request to the U.S. Department of Education for Additional Flexibility in the Inclusion of the Performance of Students with Disabilities in the Calculation of Adequate Yearly Progress
- D. First Review of Timeline for the Review and Approval of the Revised Fine Arts Standards of Learning
- E. First Review of Recommended Adjustments to Cut Scores for the Reading Subtest of the Stanford English Language Proficiency Test When Used as a Substitute for the Standards of Learning Grade 3 English Test and the Grade 5 and 8 Standards of Learning English: Reading Tests
- F. First Review of a Recommendation from the Special Committee of the Board of Education to Study and Make Recommendations Relative to Teacher Licensure Assessments

Reports

- G. Report on Status of Proposed Waivers/Amendments to Virginia's Consolidated State Application Accountability Plan Required in the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*

DISCUSSION OF CURRENT ISSUES - by Board of Education Members and Superintendent of Public Instruction

ADJOURNMENT

- H. Public Hearing on Proposed Computer Technology Standards of Learning for Grades K-12
(Upon Adjournment of Business Meeting)

ANNUAL MEETING OF THE VIRGINIA SCHOOLS FOR THE DEAF AND BLIND FOUNDATION

PUBLIC NOTICE

The Board of Education members will meet for dinner at 6:30 p.m. at the Crowne Plaza Hotel on Tuesday, May 24, 2005. Items for the Board agenda may be discussed informally at that dinner. No votes will be taken, and it is open to the public. The Board president reserves the right to change the times listed on this agenda depending upon the time constraints during the meeting.

GUIDELINES FOR PUBLIC COMMENT

1. The Board of Education is pleased to receive public comment at each of its regular monthly meetings. In order to allow the Board sufficient time for its other business, the total time allotted to public comment will generally be limited to thirty (30) minutes. Individuals seeking to speak to the Board will be allotted three (3) minutes each.
2. Those wishing to speak to the Board should contact Dr. Margaret Roberts, Executive Assistant for Board Relations at (804) 225-2924. Normally, speakers will be scheduled in the order that their requests are received until the entire allotted time slot has been used. Where issues involving a variety of views are presented before the Board, the Board reserves the right to allocate the time available so as to insure that the Board hears from different points of view on any particular issue.
3. Speakers are urged to contact Dr. Roberts in advance of the meeting. Because of time limitations, those persons who have not previously registered to speak prior to the day of the Board meeting cannot be assured that they will have an opportunity to appear before the Board.
4. In order to make the limited time available most effective, speakers are urged to provide multiple written copies of their comments or other material amplifying their views.

Board of Education Agenda Item

Item: A.

Date: May 25, 2005

Topic: First Review of a Request for Approval of an Innovative Program Involving Opening Prior to Labor Day from the Alexandria City School Board

Presenter: Ms. Anne Wescott, Assistant Superintendent for Policy and Communications
Ms. Rebecca L. Perry, Division Superintendent, Alexandria City Public Schools

Telephone Number: (804) 225-2403

E-Mail Address: Anne.Wescott@doe.virginia.gov

Origin:

☐ Topic presented for information only (no board action required)

☒ Board review required by

☒ State or federal law or regulation

☐ Board of Education regulation

☐ Other: _____

☐ Action requested at this meeting ☐ Action requested at future meeting: _____

(date)

Previous Review/Action:

☒ No previous board review/action

☐ Previous review/action

date _____

action _____

Background Information:

The *Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia*, at 8 VAC 20-131-290, permit local school boards to seek approval to implement experimental or innovative programs that do not conform to accreditation standards or other regulations promulgated by the Board and allow waivers of some Board regulations. The request must contain information that includes, but is not limited to, the purpose and objectives of the program, a description of the program, the number of students affected, the anticipated outcomes, and the evaluation procedures for measuring student achievement.

Section 22.1-79.1 of the Code of Virginia prohibits local school boards from adopting school calendars that require schools to open prior to Labor Day unless a waiver is granted by the Board for "good cause." The conditions under which the Board may grant such waivers are outlined in the Code. Part 3 of ' 22.1-79.1, as follows, permits the Board to approve a waiver from the requirements of this Code provision if the division receives approval of an experimental or innovative program when:

A school division is providing its students, in the school year for which the waiver is sought, with an experimental or innovative program which requires an earlier opening date than that established in subsection A of this section and which has been approved by the Department of Education pursuant to the regulations of the Board of Education establishing standards for accrediting public schools. However, any waiver or extension of the school year granted by the Board of Education pursuant to this subdivision or its standards for accrediting public schools for such an experimental or innovative program shall only apply to the opening date for those schools where such experimental or innovative programs are offered generally to the student body of the school. For the purposes of this subdivision, experimental or innovative programs shall include instructional programs which are offered on a year-round basis by the school division in one or more of its elementary or middle or high schools.

The following school divisions have been approved for year-round school schedules or modified calendars for the 2005-2006 school year: Arlington (one school), Danville (five schools), Fairfax County (10 schools), Prince Edward County (three schools), and Virginia Beach (four schools).

Summary of Major Elements:

The Alexandria City School Board is requesting approval of a modified school calendar for the Mount Vernon Elementary School. Approximately 45 percent of Mount Vernon students are in the English as a Second Language (ESL) program, 69 percent are eligible for free/reduced lunch, and 50 percent are enrolled in the Dual Language Program. The school division's goal is to maximize achievement for all students. The school division believes the modified school calendar would provide help for those students who need it most and minimize learning loss for all students. Parents who do not want their child to attend this school with its modified calendar may chose a school with a traditional school calendar.

If approved by the Board of Education, the modified school calendar at Mount Vernon Elementary School will begin on Monday, August 1, 2005 and continue through Thursday, June 22, 2006. There will be an intersession with remedial and enrichment activities at the end of each of the first three grading periods. Students who do not show mastery of the objectives taught during the previous nine weeks will be required to attend the intersession and will spend half of their day in remedial activities and half in enrichment activities. The school division will not charge these students a fee. Students who have met the academic objectives may choose to attend the sessions. However, the school division will charge them a modest attendance fee. The school superintendent may waive that fee for families who can demonstrate that it will create a financial hardship.

This request is consistent with other modified calendar proposals approved by the Board. A copy of the complete package submitted by the Alexandria City School Board is attached.

Superintendent's Recommendation:

The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Board receive the request for first review.

Impact on Resources: None

Timetable for Further Review/Action: Final review of the request will be conducted at the June Board of

Education meeting. In accordance with requirements adopted by the Board of Education, if this waiver is approved, the school division is required to evaluate the effectiveness of the program if the division seeks an extension of the approval for the next school year. Staff of the Department of Education will review the evaluation prior to making a recommendation to the superintendent of public instruction regarding the renewal of the approval.

Board of Education Agenda Item

Item: _____ B. _____

Date: _____ May 25, 2005 _____

Topic: First Review of a Recommendation to Approve a Teacher Education Program at Christopher Newport University

Presenter: Dr. Thomas A. Elliott, Assistant Superintendent, Division of Teacher Education and Licensure and Dr. Marsha Sprague, Director of Teacher Education, Christopher Newport University

Telephone Number: (804) 371-2522

E-Mail Address: Thomas.Elliott@doe.virginia.gov

Origin:

_____ Topic presented for information only (no board action required)

X Board review required by
_____ State or federal law or regulation
X Board of Education regulation
_____ Other: _____

X Action requested at this meeting: Waive first review and approve request for program approval.

_____ Action requested at future meeting: _____ (date)

Previous Review/Action:

_____ No previous board review/action

X Previous review/action
date July 23, 2003

action Final Board of Education approval granted to discontinue the current teacher preparation program at Christopher Newport University and approve a two-year pilot program with an on-site review and a recommendation prior to the end of the two-year period.

Background Information:

Christopher Newport University (CNU) has been approved by the Board of Education to offer programs for the preparation of school personnel since 1980. During the 2002-2003 academic year, the CNU Board of Visitors voted to discontinue certain professional preparation programs, including undergraduate teacher preparation.

In April of 2003, the Department of Education received a proposal from CNU to establish a new five-year teacher preparation program. The proposed program will allow students to graduate with a bachelor's degree in the liberal arts and a master's degree in teaching. Additionally, the proposal established a partnership agreement with teachers and administrators from the Newport News public schools and CNU faculty in the department of liberal arts. At the May 21, 2003, meeting of the Newport News school board, a partnership agreement between CNU and the Newport News public schools was adopted. On July 23, 2003, the Board of Education approved the new five-year teacher preparation program as a two-year pilot.

Summary of Major Elements

As the two-year pilot program concludes May 2005, a review of the Christopher Newport University teacher preparation program was conducted April 3-6, 2005. This review was conducted in accordance with the standards and procedures outlined in the *Regulations Governing Approved Programs for Virginia Institutions of Higher Education*, Effective July 1, 2001. The regulations governing approved programs set forth 20 standards in the following four categories:

- I. Program Design
- II. Faculty
- III. Candidates, and
- IV. Program Operation/Accountability.

The review team makes a recommendation of met or not met for each of the 20 standards. In addition, the team makes a recommendation of approved, approved with stipulations, or denied for the teacher preparation program as a whole. One of these three recommendations also is made for each teaching endorsement area program offered by the institution. The on-site review team recommendation for the Christopher Newport University teacher preparation program is approved. The review team recommendations was forwarded to the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure (ABTEL) and at its May 11, 2005, meeting voted approved with stipulations based on weaknesses (i.e., one standard not met and 11 weaknesses) cited in the on-site review team report.

Approved with stipulations means that the institution's professional education school or department and endorsement programs does not meet all standards or has met the standards minimally with significant weaknesses. The university will submit to the Board of Education a report of corrective action identifying a specific period of time in which weaknesses are to be addressed within 90 days following action by the board.

Superintendent's Recommendation:

The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Board of Education receive for first review the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure recommendation to grant approved with stipulations to the teacher preparation program at Christopher Newport University with a report of corrective action to be submitted by the university on or before August 23, 2005, (90 days) following action by the board.

Impact on Resources:

Expenses incurred during on site review of teacher education programs are funded by the hosting institution.

Timetable for Further Review/Action:

Teacher preparation programs reviewed under the state approval process are conducted on a five-year cycle. Programs that do not meet standards for continuing full approval may be reviewed as needed. Following submission of the detailed report of corrective action, an on site review of the program will be scheduled.

Board of Education Agenda Item

Item: _____ C. _____

Date: _____ May 25, 2005 _____

Topic: First Review of Request to the U.S. Department of Education for Additional Flexibility in the Inclusion of the Performance of Students with Disabilities in the Calculation of Adequate Yearly Progress

Presenter: Mrs. Shelley Loving-Ryder, Assistant Superintendent for Assessment and Reporting, and Mr. H. Douglas Cox, Assistant Superintendent for Special Education and Student Services

Telephone Number: (804) 225-2102 and (804) 225-3252

E-Mail Address: Shelley.Loving-Ryder@doe.virginia.gov and Doug.Cox@doe.virginia.gov

Origin:

_____ Topic presented for information only (no board action required)

☒ Board review required by
☒ State or federal law or regulation
_____ Board of Education regulation
_____ Other: _____

☒ Action requested at this meeting _____ Action requested at future meeting: _____ (date)

Previous Review/Action:

☒ No previous board review/action
_____ Previous review/action
date _____
action _____

Background Information:

On April 7, Secretary of Education Margaret Spellings announced plans to increase flexibility with regard to the inclusion of students with disabilities in calculating adequate yearly progress (AYP). On May 10, in a letter sent to all states, Secretary Spellings provided additional information regarding this flexibility. In the letter she noted that “in addition to students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, research now indicates that there is another group of students with disabilities who can make significant progress but may not reach grade-level achievement standards within the same time frame as other students. This research shows that, even after receiving the best-designed instructional interventions from highly trained instructors, a group of students with academic disabilities, comprising approximately two percent of the school-age population, is not able to achieve at grade level. They are able to make significant progress toward grade-level standards when provided high-quality instructional interventions and measured with appropriate assessment instruments.”

Secretary Spelling's letter informed states that the United States Department of Education (USED) "intends to issue a notice of proposed rulemaking in the near future that would permit States: (a) to develop modified achievement standards for a limited group of students with disabilities, as defined in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, (b) to develop alternate assessments (based on those modified achievement standards) that are aligned with grade-level content standards, and (c) to include proficient scores from these assessments (subject to a 2.0 percent cap at the district and State level) in determining AYP. The goal of these regulations would be to ensure that States hold those students to challenging, though modified, achievement standards that enable them to approach, and even meet, grade-level standards; ensure these students access to the general curriculum; measure their progress with high-quality alternate assessments; provide guidance and training to Individualized Education Program teams to identify these students properly; and provide professional development to regular and special education teachers regarding successful interventions."

Because the regulations will not be prepared in time to impact the current school year, the USED has proposed an interim policy that will allow states to calculate a proxy to determine the percentage of special education students that is equivalent to two percent of all students assessed. The proxy is calculated by dividing 2.0 by the percentage of students who have been identified as having a disability. The proxy will be added to the pass rate of the students with disabilities subgroup only when calculating AYP for the 2005-2006 year based on data from 2004-2005. This provision applies only to AYP ratings for the 2005-2006 school year and is limited to schools and divisions that fail to make AYP solely due to the performance of students with disabilities. Schools and divisions that fail to meet AYP based on the performance of other subgroups or participation rates will not be eligible for this flexibility.

In order to be eligible to take advantage of this interim policy, states must meet the following criteria:

- Statewide assessment participation rates for students with disabilities, for purposes of measuring AYP, must be at or above 95%;
- Alternate assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics must be available for students with disabilities who are unable to participate in the regular assessment even with accommodations, and (as required by IDEA) States must report results to the Secretary and the public based on these alternate assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics. States with IDEA Special Conditions may not be eligible if such conditions cannot be resolved by July 1, 2005;
- Appropriate accommodations are available for students with disabilities; and
- A State seeking to use this interim policy must explain how students with disabilities are included in its accountability system. Specifically, a State's subgroup size for students with disabilities must be equal to that of the overall group size.

States that meet the above criteria may submit a worksheet to USED requesting authorization to apply the proxy to the 2005-2006 AYP calculation. The worksheet is to be submitted by June 1, 2005. A copy of the AYP Addendum Worksheet is attached.

Once the federal regulations governing this new policy are finalized, states who are approved to take advantage of the interim flexibility will be required to develop modified achievement standards for this population following the criteria listed below.

- The State must commit to have in place no later than 2006-07 reliable and valid alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards for a limited group of students with disabilities. Please note that, under both IDEA and NCLB, students with disabilities may not be

exempted from State assessments, even while assessments based on modified achievement standards are being developed.

- The State must commit to ensuring that it provides a wide variety of appropriate accommodations that improve the validity of assessment results for students with disabilities.
- A State that has developed alternate achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities must provide assurance that those standards are aligned with the State's content standards, promote access to the general curriculum, and reflect professional judgment on the highest achievement standards possible, as required by 34 CFR §200.1(d).
- The State must provide information and a time line with regard to how the State will work over the next two years to develop and ensure effective implementation of its alternate assessments.

Summary of Major Elements:

Virginia meets the criteria required to take advantage of the interim policy as noted in the background section. Much of the information needed for the worksheet is already on file at USED through various reports. Additional information may be submitted if necessary.

The USED will review the information submitted to determine if Virginia is eligible for the interim AYP flexibility. If determined eligible, the Department of Education will develop modified achievement standards for applicable students with disabilities, based upon final regulations.

Superintendent's Recommendation:

The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Board of Education waive first review and authorize the Department of Education to submit the worksheet and seek authorization to apply the proxy to the calculation of AYP for 2005-2006 and, if determined eligible by the USED, to develop modified achievement standards in accordance with federal requirements.

Impact on Resources:

Application of the interim flexibility will have minimal impact on resources. Development of modified achievement standards will require undetermined resources.

Timetable for Further Review/Action:

An update on Virginia's request to exercise the interim flexibility will become part of the Department's monthly report to the Board of Education on No Child Left Behind issues.

AYP ADDENDUM WORKSHEET

For most data elements in Sections I and II, the Department has the necessary data and a State does not need to resubmit them. If a State wants to submit any updated or explanatory information, send it to the Department by email at AYPAmendments@ed.gov by June 1, 2005.

I. Core Principles

The Department has most of the following information available through the 2003-04 State Consolidated Performance Reports, Part I; Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) monitoring findings related to alternate assessments; and State accountability workbooks and supporting evidence. States should submit information regarding the availability of appropriate accommodations since the Department would only have information about accommodations (item 4) if it is posted on a State's website.

1. Participation rates for students with disabilities
2. Availability of alternate assessments
3. Reporting of results from alternate assessments
4. Availability of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities
5. Minimum group sizes for making AYP decisions

II. Student Achievement

The Department has this information available through the 2002-03 and 2003-04 State Consolidated Performance Reports, Part I.

6. Student achievement in reading, for students with disabilities, 2002-03 school year
7. Student achievement in mathematics, for students with disabilities, 2002-03 school year
8. Student achievement in reading, for students with disabilities, 2003-04 school year
9. Student achievement in mathematics, for students with disabilities, 2003-04 school year

III. Sound State Education Policies

A State should submit the information for Section III by email at AYPAmendments@ed.gov; the ideal deadline for submitting information in Section III is June 15, 2005. States needing assistance with Section III should contact the Department; we will work with States to provide the required information. Please describe how the State intends to take these steps and provide estimated time lines for when these requirements will be completed.

10. Document the technical quality of the alternate assessments for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, if not previously completed.
11. Develop criteria and guidance for IEP teams regarding identification of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities and for setting appropriate proficiency expectations for those students.
12. Demonstrate that policies are in place to ensure inclusion of all students in the assessment system, as required by IDEA and NCLB.

13. Provide training to IEP teams on State assessment guidelines and policies, as required under IDEA and NCLB regulations.
14. Train teachers on instructional interventions, including special education teachers and general education teachers with subject matter expertise, on how to work together, provide access to the general curriculum, and use data to improve student achievement.
15. Conduct outreach to parents of students with disabilities to explain State testing policies. This outreach may take several forms, such as website documents; brochures for parent centers, schools, and districts; or training for parent liaisons.
16. Incorporate appropriately the scores of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities into the State reporting and accountability system.
17. Submit all alternate assessments for the Department's peer review process for standards and assessments.

In addition to the above steps, States should also commit to the following steps as part of the overall strategy to improve assessments for students with disabilities, in particular for the development of alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards. Please provide an assurance that the State will complete these steps.

- Develop and formally approve or adopt modified academic achievement descriptors.
- Build a framework, including purpose and scope of alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, that addresses key questions and issues (e.g., portfolio or multiple choice) and is informed by stakeholder and technical advisory committee input.
- Contract for the development of valid alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards for students with disabilities who need to take a modified assessment (as well as students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, if applicable).
- Establish (with diverse stakeholder involvement) and formally approve or adopt modified achievement standards with "cut scores" that differentiate among achievement levels and are aligned with State content standards.
- Document the technical quality of the alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards.
- Demonstrate that policies are in place to ensure inclusion of all students in the assessment system, as required by IDEA and NCLB.

Board of Education Agenda Item

Item: _____ D. _____

Date: May 25, 2005

Topic: First Review of Timeline for the Review and Approval of the Revised Fine Arts Standards of Learning

Presenter: Dr. Linda Wallinger, Assistant Superintendent for Instruction

Telephone Number: 804-225-2034 **E-Mail Address:** Linda.Wallinger@doe.virginia.gov

Origin:

____ Topic presented for information only (no board action required)

____ Board review required by

☒ State or federal law or regulation

____ Board of Education regulation

____ Other: _____

☒ Action requested at this meeting ____ Action requested at future meeting:

Previous Review/Action:

☒ No previous board review/action

____ Previous review/action

date _____

action _____

Background Information:

The Board of Education adopted a schedule for review and revisions to the Standards of Learning at its September 28, 2000, meeting. Accordingly, the fine arts standards are scheduled for revision in 2006.

Code of Virginia § 22.1-253.13:1-2 By October 1, 2000, the Board of Education shall establish a regular schedule, in a manner it deems appropriate, for the review, and revision as may be necessary, of the Standards of Learning in all subject areas. Such review of each subject area shall occur at least once every seven years. Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit the Board from conducting such review and revision on a more frequent basis.

Summary of Major Elements:

Using an established review process and criteria, the Department of Education plans a review of the current Standards of Learning for Fine Arts. Additionally, proposed standards for Drama III and IV will be drafted. A proposed timeline is attached.

Superintendent's Recommendation:

The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the board waive first review and approve the timeline.

Impact on Resources:

The Department of Education administers the state standards review process. The agency's existing resources can absorb this responsibility at this time.

Timetable for Further Review/Action:

Upon approval, the Department of Education will provide information to all interested parties according to the attached timeline.

PROPOSED SCHEDULE FOR THE REVIEW OF THE FINE ARTS STANDARDS OF LEARNING

May 27, 2005	<p>A Superintendent's Memorandum is distributed that: announces the schedule of the review process; announces the availability of a Standards of Learning review/comment page on the Department of Education Web site; requests that division superintendents share information about the Web site with instructional staff; and requests that division superintendents submit nominations for review team members.</p> <p>The Department of Education posts on its Web site a Standards of Learning review/comment page for the 2000 Fine Arts Standards of Learning. The page will be active for 30 days.</p>
July 2005	<p>The Department of Education aggregates and conducts a preliminary analysis of the comments entered on the Web page.</p>
July-August 2005	<p>The Standards of Learning review team meets for two days to: analyze statewide Web page input; review national documents and reports as necessary; and make recommendations for potential changes.</p> <p>The theatre arts review team meets an additional two days to draft proposed Standards of Learning for Drama III and IV.</p>
August 2005	<p>The Department of Education prepares the review team's comments in a draft.</p>
September 2005	<p>The Department of Education and the steering committee (a subgroup of the review team) meet to discuss and review the draft Fine Arts Standards of Learning for first review by the Board of Education.</p>
October 2005	<p>The Department of Education presents the draft document to the board for first review.</p>
November 2005	<p>The proposed Standards of Learning document is distributed for public comment. The document is placed on the Virginia Department of Education Web site for review. One or more public hearings are held as prescribed by the Board of Education.</p>
February 2006	<p>The Superintendent of Public Instruction presents the proposed Fine Arts Standards of Learning to the Board of Education for final review and adoption. The final document is posted on the Department of Education Web site within three weeks of adoption.</p>
April 2006	<p>Printed copies of the approved Fine Arts Standards of Learning are distributed to K-12 schools and local school division central offices.</p>

Board of Education Agenda Item

Item: E.

Date: May 25, 2005

Topic: First Review of Recommended Adjustments to Cut Scores for the Reading Subtest of the Stanford English Language Proficiency Test When Used as a Substitute for the Standards of Learning Grade 3 English Test and the Grade 5 and 8 Standards of Learning English: Reading Tests

Presenter: Mrs. Shelley Loving-Ryder, Assistant Superintendent, Division of Assessment and Reporting

Telephone Number: 804/225-2102

E-Mail Address: Shelley.Loving-Ryder@doe.virginia.gov

Origin:

☐ Topic presented for information only (no board action required)

☒ Board review required by

☐ State or federal law or regulation

☒ Board of Education regulation

☐ Other:

☒ Action requested at this meeting ☐ Action requested at future meeting: (date)

Previous Review/Action:

☐ No previous board review/action

☒ Previous review/action

date April 2004

action Adopted cut scores

Background Information

The United States Department of Education (USED) approved Virginia's Accountability Workbook in June 2003. This accountability workbook states in part:

Effective with the 2003-2004 academic year, all limited English proficient (LEP) students will participate in the Virginia state assessment program. LEP students in grades 3-8 at the lower levels (Level 1 and Level 2) of English language proficiency will take the Standards of Learning assessment for English: reading and mathematics, with or without accommodations, or state approved assessments linked to the Standards of Learning.

The Stanford English Language Proficiency (SELP) Test is used to assess the English proficiency of LEP students in Virginia. This test, which measures proficiency in speaking, listening, reading, and writing English, is linked to Virginia's English language proficiency standards and thus to the English Standards of Learning. LEP students at levels 1 and 2 of English language proficiency may take the reading subset of the SELP instead of the SOL English: reading test.

At its April 2004 meeting, the Board of Education approved cut scores for the SELP reading test that would be equivalent to pass/proficient on the SOL grade 3 English test, the grade 5 English: reading

test, and the grade 8 English: reading test.

Following the administration of the SELP test in spring 2004, Virginia educators recommended to Department of Education staff that the reading subtest of the SELP needed to be augmented to more closely match Virginia's Standards of Learning. Department staff worked with committees of Virginia educators and Harcourt staff to augment the SELP reading tests for the spring 2005 administration. Because of the change in content for these tests, new cut scores to represent "pass/proficient" on the SOL grade 3 English test and the English: reading tests at grades 5 and 8 need to be set. Consistent with the process used to set scores on the SOL tests, committees of educators were convened in early May 2005 to recommend to the Board of Education minimum cut scores on the reading subtest of the SELP that would be equivalent to scores of pass/proficient on the SOL grade 3 English test, the grade 5 English: reading test and the grade 8 English: reading test.

Summary of Major Elements: Information about the range of cut scores recommended by the committees for the SELP reading subtest for pass/proficient will be presented. The Board is asked to review this information and to adopt cut scores on the reading subtest of the SELP that would be equivalent to scores of pass/proficient on the SOL grade 3 English test, the grade 5 English: reading test and the grade 8 English: reading test.

Superintendent's Recommendation: The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Board waive first review and adopt cut scores for the SELP test that are equivalent to pass/proficient on the grade 3 English test and the English: reading tests for grade 5 and 8.

Impact on Resources: N/A

Timetable for Further Review/Action: N/A

Board of Education Agenda Item

Item: _____ F. _____

Date: _____ May 25, 2005 _____

Topic: First Review of a Recommendation from the Special Committee of the Board of Education to Study and Make Recommendations Relative to Teacher Licensure Assessments

Presenter: Mr. Thomas M. Jackson, Jr., President of the Virginia Board of Education

Telephone Number: _____ **E-Mail Address:** _____

Origin:

_____ Topic presented for information only (no board action required)

X Board review required by

X State or federal law or regulation

_____ Board of Education regulation

_____ Other: _____

_____ Action requested at this meeting _____ Action requested at future meeting: _____ (date)

Previous Review/Action:

_____ No previous board review/action

X Previous review/action

date March 23, 2005

action The Board of Education approved the establishment of the Special Committee of the Board of Education to Study and Make Recommendations Relative to Teacher Licensure Assessments.

Background Information:

The Board of Education is authorized to prescribe requirements for the licensure of teachers. Section 22.1-298 of the Code of Virginia states, in part, the following:

- A. The Board of Education shall, by regulation, prescribe the requirements for licensure of teachers. Regardless of the authority of any other agency of the Commonwealth to approve educational programs, only the Board of Education shall have the authority to license teachers to be regularly employed by school boards, including those teachers employed to provide nursing education.

B. Such regulations shall include requirements that:

1. Every teacher seeking initial licensure take a professional teacher's examination prescribed by the Board;...

C. Notwithstanding any provision of law to the contrary, the Board may provide for the issuance of a provisional license, valid for a period not to exceed three years, to any person who does not meet the requirements of this section or any other requirement for licensure imposed by law.

On March 23, 2005, the Virginia Board of Education approved the establishment of a *Special Committee of the Board of Education to Study and Make Recommendations Relative to Teacher Licensure Assessments*. The committee was charged with the responsibility of examining the use of teacher licensure assessments in Virginia and other states and make recommendations to the Board of Education. The committee's work was to include, but not be limited to, an examination of appropriate sections of the *Code* including regulations governing licensure of teachers; the federal requirements regarding teacher quality; the use of teacher licensure assessments in other states; and options for using various teacher licensure assessments in the preparation and licensing of teachers.

Summary of Major Elements:

The *Special Committee of the Board of Education to Study and Make Recommendations Relative to Teacher Licensure Assessments* was established and included representation from the Board of Education, Virginia General Assembly, Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure, the Virginia Congress of Parents and Teachers, the Virginia Education Association, the State Council for Higher Education in Virginia, institutions of higher education with approved teacher education programs, school division superintendents, school principals, and school division human resources directors.

The committee held four meetings on the following dates: March 31, 2005, April 13, 2005, April 22, 2005, and May 10, 2005. During the meetings, the committee received presentations on national and state perspectives on teacher education and licensure assessments and engaged in discussions with presenters. The presenters from other states included Jane P. Norwood, Vice-Chair, North Carolina Board of Education; Dr. Carol Gilbert, Executive Director for Educator Preparation and Quality, Massachusetts Department of Education; Dr. Marilyn Troyer, Associate Superintendent for the Teaching Profession, Ohio Department of Education; and Dr. Louise A. Tanney, Coordinator of Teacher and Principal Assessment, Division of Certification and Accreditation, Maryland State Department of Education. In addition, the following individuals presented national perspectives on assessments: Dr. Charles Coble, Vice-President, Policy Studies and Programs, Education Commission of the States, Denver, Colorado; Kate Walsh, President of the National Council on Teacher Quality, Washington, DC; Dr. Jane Hannaway, Education Policy Urban Institute for Economic and Social Policy Research, Washington, DC; and Dr. Randy Thompson, Vice-President of the American Board for Certification of Teacher Excellence (ABCTE), Washington, DC. Opportunities for public comment also were provided during two of the four committee meetings.

During the May 10, 2005, meeting the committee unanimously approved the following recommendation and implementation requirements to be submitted to the Board of Education for review and action:

The Special Committee of the Board of Education to Study and Make Recommendations Relative to Teacher Licensure Assessments recommended that the Board of Education prescribe the following professional teacher's examinations for initial licensure in Virginia: (1) Literacy and Communication Skills Assessment; (2) Praxis II (content assessment); and (3) if applicable, the Virginia Reading Assessment.

The implementation of the prescribed professional teacher's examinations would include the following guidelines:

1. The assessments [Literacy and Communication Skills Assessment, Praxis II, and the Virginia Reading Assessment (VRA), if applicable] will be required for all individuals seeking initial licensure in Virginia except individuals who have completed a minimum of two years of full-time, successful teaching experience with an effective license from another state at the time of application. The proposed effective date for the implementation of the licensure assessments is January 1, 2006, depending on the timeframe to develop the Literacy and Communication Skills assessment.
2. The Literacy and Communication Skills Assessment will be composed of two areas—reading and writing. The test will measure communication and literacy skills necessary to teach and communicate effectively with parents and others in the education community.

[Individuals will be asked to demonstrate comprehension and analysis of readings; development of ideas in essay form on specific topics, outlining and summarizing; interpreting tables and graphs; mastery of grammar, and mechanics; vocabulary; and writing.]
3. Requirements for admission into approved programs, including entry assessments, will be set forth in the *Regulations Governing the Approved Programs for Virginia Institutions of Higher Education*.
4. Individuals otherwise eligible for licensure who have not completed the assessment requirements may be issued a provisional license not to exceed one full school year. (This guideline was approved by the special committee by a vote of 7 to 5.)
5. Individuals seeking the Pupil Personnel Services License and the Technical Professional License will not be subject to the assessments. *Regulations Governing the Approved Programs for Virginia Institutions of Higher Education* and the *Regulations Governing the Licensure of School Personnel* will set forth the communication and literacy competencies for these license types.

Superintendent's Recommendation: N/A

Impact on Resources: N/A

Timetable for Further Review/Action:

Board of Education Agenda Item

Item: G.

Date: May 25, 2005

Topic: Report on Status of Proposed Waivers/Amendments to Virginia's Consolidated State Application Accountability Plan Required in the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*

Presenter: Dr. Patricia I. Wright, Deputy Superintendent

Telephone Number: (804) 225-2979

E-Mail Address: Patricia.Wright@doe.virginia.gov

Origin:

☒ Topic presented for information only (no board action required)

☐ Board review required by

☐ State or federal law or regulation

☐ Board of Education regulation

☐ Other: _____

☐ Action requested at this meeting ☐ Action requested at future meeting: _____ (date)

Previous Review/Action:

☐ No previous board review/action

☒ Previous review/action

date January 19, 2005/April 20, 2005 action Board approved proposed amendment/waiver requests

Background Information:

The *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (NCLB), which is a reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), requires all state educational agencies (SEA) to submit for approval to the United States Department of Education (USED) individual program applications or a consolidated state application. A major component of the consolidated application is Virginia's Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook that describes a single statewide accountability system for the commonwealth. The accountability workbook that describes the policies and procedures that were used to determine Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) ratings for the 2003-2004 school year are described in the amended workbook dated May 26, 2004.

At its January 19, 2005, meeting the Virginia Board of Education adopted proposed waivers/amendments to the Consolidated State Application Accountability Plan (amended May 26, 2004) required in the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (NCLB).

On January 20, 2005, President of the Board Thomas M. Jackson communicated the board's actions to the United States Department of Education (USED) and asked USED to approve the requests as specific waivers permitted in Section 9401 of the federal law. These waivers/amendments are based on two years

of implementing NCLB and identification of certain procedures in implementing AYP policies that may result in unintended consequences.

The statutory authority that permits states to request, and the U.S. Secretary of Education to approve, waivers to requirements in NCLB is found in Section 9401 of the federal law:

“SEC. 9401. WAIVERS OF STATUTORY AND REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL- Except as provided in subsection (c), the Secretary may waive any statutory or regulatory requirement of this Act for a State educational agency, local educational agency, Indian tribe, or school through a local educational agency, that —

- (1) receives funds under a program authorized by this Act; and
- (2) requests a waiver under subsection (b).”

Virginia’s proposed waiver requests are categorized into five major areas:

- (1) application of the “other academic indicator” (in addition to performance and participation on the reading and mathematics tests) that is used to make AYP determinations when safe harbor is not invoked,
- (2) how states determine if a school or school division makes AYP and enters improvement status,
- (3) use of test scores from multiple administrations,
- (4) testing and AYP calculation policies for limited English proficient students, and
- (5) testing and AYP calculation policies for students with disabilities.

On January 28, 2005, President Jackson, Superintendent of Public Instruction Jo Lynne DeMary, and Deputy Superintendent Patricia Wright met with Assistant Secretary of Education Ray Simon and the new Secretary of Education’s Chief of Staff David Dunn to discuss Virginia’s waiver requests. During that meeting, USED officials described Virginia’s requests in one of three categories: policy, regulatory, or statute.

On February 1, 2005, USED sent a letter to President Jackson indicating the “graduation rate” amendment to be acceptable and the “new minimum n” amendment to be acceptable with modifications. Both of these requests were considered USED policy interpretations and did not require a waiver of regulation or statute. The letter stated USED would get back with Virginia on the remaining amendment/waiver requests as soon as they reach a decision on their acceptability.

On April 4, 2005, USED issued a letter to President Jackson rejecting Virginia’s request for a waiver on annually testing the reading and writing skills of limited English proficient (LEP) students in kindergarten and first grade.

On April 7, 2005, Secretary of Education Margaret Spellings promised additional flexibility for states that adhere to what she described as the four key principles of the law:

- Ensuring students are learning
- Making the school system accountable

- Ensuring information is accessible and parents have options
- Improving teacher quality

Summary of Major Elements:

At its April 20, 2005, meeting the Virginia Board of Education affirmed a position stated in the accountability workbook and approved the use of separate starting points and annual measurable objectives in each subgroup (i.e., reporting category) based on actual student performance as a proposed growth model in determining Adequate Yearly Progress for schools, divisions, and the state.

On April 28, 2005, President Jackson communicated to USED this additional waiver/amendment requesting the use of separate starting points and annual measurable objectives in each subgroup in determining AYP.

On May 10, 2005, Secretary Spellings announced a process for seeking approval of additional flexibility for making AYP determinations for the students with disabilities subgroup based on 2004-2005 assessments. States must apply and be approved for this flexibility.

Unclear at this point is how the Secretary's announcement will affect the Board of Education's pending waiver requests, which were submitted to USED at the end of January.

Superintendent's Recommendation: N/A

Impact on Resources: The Virginia Department of Education is working with a consortium of the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) to identify the cost of implementing NCLB.

Timetable for Further Review/Action: Upon USED approval, Virginia plans to implement the proposed amendments/waivers in determining AYP and improvement status of schools and divisions based on the 2004-2005 test administration.



COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

BOARD OF EDUCATION

227 North Main Street

Post Office Box 130

Hillsville, VA 24343

(276) 728-3737

(276) 728-3133 (FAX)

Thomas M. Jackson, Jr.
President

April 28, 2005

The Honorable Raymond Simon
Assistant Secretary
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education
United States Department of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D. C. 20202

Dear Assistant Secretary Simon:

On January 20, 2005, the Virginia Board of Education submitted twelve proposed amendment/waiver requests to the Consolidated State Application Accountability Plan (amended May 26, 2004) required in the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB)*. To date, the state Board of Education has received from the United States Department of Education (USED) an informal letter concerning two of the proposed amendments and a formal rejection of a requested waiver from testing reading and writing skills of limited English proficient (LEP) children in kindergarten and first grade. Since Virginia asked to implement the revised policies beginning in the 2004-2005 school year, it is urgent that USED respond to our requests immediately.

The purpose of this letter is to respond to the U.S. Secretary of Education's recent press release, *Raising Achievement: A New Path for No Child Left Behind*. On April 7, 2005, Secretary of Education Margaret Spellings announced that USED plans to give consideration to the use of growth models in determining Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). The announcement stated, "...Another example of such flexibility could include a request for the use of growth models; or States may have their own proposals for demonstrating progress and effective implementation..."

I would like to remind USED of language in Virginia's Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook that has been in place since its original submission in June 2003.

The workbook states:

This consolidated application workbook is based on the interpretation of NCLB regulations as mandating a single starting point in both English and math for all reporting categories for purposes of establishing progress benchmarks for AYP between now and 2014. Should the NCLB regulations permit it, in the alternative, the Virginia SEA would request to establish individual starting points in each reporting category which would be based upon actual data of student performance in each reporting category for the prior three years. (Virginia Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook, Critical Element 3.2(a) (amended May 26, 2004))

At its April 20, 2005, meeting the state Board of Education affirmed the position stated in the accountability workbook and approved the use of separate starting points and annual measurable objectives in each subgroup (i.e., reporting category) based on actual student performance as a proposed growth model in determining Adequate Yearly Progress for schools, divisions, and the state. Please add Virginia's proposed growth model to the January 20, 2005, amendment/waiver submission (see attachment). Upon receiving a response to all of our requests, the Virginia Board of Education will adopt the specific annual measurable objectives for each reporting category and submit to USED an amended accountability workbook.

Secretary of Education Margaret Spellings has promised additional flexibility for states that adhere to what she described as the four core principles of the law: ensuring students are learning; making the school system accountable; ensuring information is accessible and parents have options; and improving teacher quality. Secretary Spellings' promise of additional flexibility is encouraging. The Virginia Standards of Learning program is based on these four core principles. Unclear at this point, however, is how the Secretary's April 7 announcement will affect the Virginia Board of Education's pending waiver requests, which were submitted to USED at the end of January.

As I stated in my letter of January 20, the success of Virginia's standards-based accountability program is due in large part to the willingness of policymakers to listen to practitioners and take steps to prevent unintended consequences. Virginia embraces the four core principles of NCLB. More importantly, Virginia has established sound educational policies to implement these core principles. The result has been improved student achievement on challenging academic standards. With additional flexibility at the state level to implement the goals and intent of NCLB, Virginia will expand its efforts to close the achievement gap.

The Honorable Raymond Simon
April 28, 2005
Page 3

Your consideration and approval of Virginia's request are appreciated. If you have questions, please contact me or Dr. Jo Lynne DeMary, Superintendent of Public Instruction, at 804-225-2023.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Thomas M. Jackson". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a stylized "J" and "A".

Thomas M. Jackson
President, Board of Education

Attachment

cc: Jo Lynne DeMary
Superintendent of Public Instruction

Proposed Amendments to Virginia Consolidated State Application Accountability Plan Required in NCLB

**Adopted by Virginia Board of Education: April 20, 2005
Addendum to January 19, 2005 Amendment Request**

NCLB Statutory Authority for Amendment Requests:

"SEC. 9401. WAIVERS OF STATUTORY AND REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL- Except as provided in subsection (c), the Secretary may waive any statutory or regulatory requirement of this Act for a State educational agency, local educational agency, Indian tribe, or school through a local educational agency, that —

(1) receives funds under a program authorized by this Act; and

(2) requests a waiver under subsection (b)."

11. AYP: Growth Model Based on Separate Starting Points and Annual Measurable Objectives in Each Subgroup (Critical Elements 3.2(a), 3.2(b), 3.2(c))

Request: Virginia will establish and implement a growth model for determining Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) of schools, divisions, and the state using separate starting points and annual measurable objectives in each reporting category (i.e., subgroup) based on actual student performance in each category for the prior three years.

Rationale: Virginia will implement the preferred policy for determining AYP as stated in Virginia's Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook, which has been in place since its submission in June 2003. The workbook states:

This consolidated application workbook is based on the interpretation of NCLB regulations as mandating a single starting point in both English and math for all reporting categories for purposes of establishing progress benchmarks for AYP between now and 2014. Should the NCLB regulations permit it, in the alternative, the Virginia SEA would request to establish individual starting points in each reporting category which would be based upon actual data of student performance in each reporting category for the prior three years. (Virginia Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook, Critical Element 3.2(a) (amended May 26, 2004))

NCLB defines AYP primarily on whether each student subgroup achieves the annual measurable objectives (proficiency pass rates) on state assessments in reading and mathematics. The annual measurable objectives in reading and mathematics are derived from the pass rates of students in the aggregate. However, AYP decisions are based on using the same pass rate for all student groups. This model does not fully value progress with subgroups starting significantly below proficiency. Virginia is committed to meeting AYP for all students, but the current system does not sufficiently value the progress Virginia has made with students overall or the progress for lower-performing subgroups.

Permitting states with a history of standards, assessment, and accountability to set separate starting points and trajectories based on actual performance of student subgroups will lead to more valid AYP determinations.

Board of Education Agenda Item

Item: _____ H. _____

Date: _____ May 25, 2005 _____

Topic: Public Hearing for the Proposed Computer/Technology Standards of Learning for Grades K-12

Presenter: Mr. Lan Neugent, Assistant Superintendent for Technology

Telephone Number: 804-225-2757

E-Mail Address: Lan.Neugent@doe.virginia.gov

Origin:

☐ Topic presented for information only (no board action required)

☐ Board review required by

☒ State or federal law or regulation

☐ Board of Education regulation

☐ Other: _____

☐ Action requested at this meeting

☒ Action requested at future meeting:

Final approval of the Computer/Technology Standards of Learning for Grades K-12.

Previous Review/Action:

☐ No previous board review/action

☒ Previous review/action

First Review of the Timeline for the Review and Approval of the Computer/Technology Standards of Learning for Grades K-12

date: September 22, 2004

action: The Board of Education accepted the timeline for the review process for the Computer/Technology Standards of Learning.

First Review of the Computer/Technology Standards of Learning for Grades K-12

date: March 25, 2005

action: The Board of Education approved the dissemination of the proposed Computer/Technology Standards of Learning and established a date for public hearings.

Background Information:

The Board of Education adopted a schedule for review and revisions to the Standards of Learning at its September 22, 2004, meeting. Accordingly, the Computer/Technology Standards of Learning are scheduled for revision in 2005. (Code of Virginia § 22.1-253.13:1-2 By October 1, 2000, the Board of Education shall establish a regular schedule, in a manner it deems appropriate, for the review, and revision as may be necessary, of the Standards of Learning in all subject areas. Such review of each subject area shall occur at least once every seven years. Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit the Board from

conducting such review and revision on a more frequent basis.)

Summary of Major Elements

A review of comments on the existing Computer/Technology Standards for Grades K-12 revealed several major areas of concern:

- There is insufficient emphasis on the ethical and responsible use of computers
- Computer/technology skills should not be taught in isolation; but integrated in all areas of the curriculum
- Instruction of computer skills should not be limited to specific grade levels or content areas
- Students need earlier exposure to a variety of technologies and software applications

In response to input, a set of standards were drafted that address the concerns of educational technology stakeholders as well as reflect a consensus of identification of technology skills and competencies that students in grades K-12 should exhibit. The proposed standards cover foundation technology skills and competencies for students that include:

- Basic Operations and Concepts
- Social, Ethical, and Human Issues
- Technology Productivity Tools
- Technology Communication Tools
- Technology Research Tools
- Technology Problem-Solving and Decision-Making Tools

Since the introduction of the current Computer/Technology Standards in 1995 and 2000, the use of technology in schools and classrooms has increased and the use of newer, more advanced technologies has become commonplace. The proposed standards are organized into four grade ranges: K-2, 3-5, 6-8, and 9-12. This provides greater opportunity for students to develop, reinforce, and amplify their skills.

Following the March 23, 2005, Board of Education meeting, a superintendent's memo was distributed. The proposed standards were included in the memo along with information announcing the public hearing on May 25, 2005. An email address was also provided to receive comments. Information regarding the proposed standards and the public hearing was communicated to various stakeholder groups and organizations.

Superintendent's Recommendation:

N/A

Impact on Resources:

The Department of Education administers the state standards review process. The agency's existing resources can absorb this responsibility at this time.

Timetable for Further Review/Action:

Following the public hearing the Computer/Technology Standards for Learning for Grades K-12 will be presented for final action by the board at the June 2005 meeting. Upon adoption by the board, the Department of Education will distribute the Computer/Technology Standards for Learning for Grades K-12 to school divisions and implement procedures for providing technical assistance and resources as part of the statewide system of support.

**Proposed
Computer/Technology Standards of Learning
Grades K-2**

Basic operations and concepts

Students demonstrate an understanding of the nature and operation of technology systems.

C/T K-2.1

- a) Identify the computer as a machine that helps people at school, work, and play.
- b) Demonstrate an ability to perform a variety of tasks; among them turning on and off a computer, starting and closing programs, saving work, creating folders, using pull-down menus, closing windows, dragging objects, and responding to commands.

Students are proficient in the use of technology.

C/T K-2.2

- a) Demonstrate the use of mouse, keyboard, printer, multimedia devices, and earphones.
- b) Use multimedia resources such as interactive books and software with graphical interfaces.

Social, ethical, and human issues

Students practice responsible use of technology systems, information, and software.

C/T K-2.3

- a) Know the school's rules for using computers.
- b) Understand the importance of not sharing personal information or passwords with others.
- c) Understand the basic principles of the ownership of ideas.

Students develop positive attitudes towards technology.

C/T K-2.4

- a) Demonstrate respect for the rights of others while using computers.
- b) Understand the responsible use of equipment and resources.

Technology research tools

Students use technology to locate, evaluate, and collect information from a variety of sources.

C/T K-2.5

- a) Identify information in various formats.
- b) Identify available sources of information.

Problem-solving and decision-making tools

Students use technology resources for solving problems and making informed decisions.

C/T K-2.6

- a) Recognize that technology can be used to solve problems and make informed decisions.
- b) Identify and select technologies to address problems.

Technology communication tools

Students use a variety of media and formats to communicate information and ideas effectively to multiple audiences.

C/T K-2.7

- a) Identify the best tool to communicate information.
- b) Use technology tools for individual writing, communication, and publishing activities.
- c) Demonstrate the ability to create, save, retrieve, and print document.

**Proposed
Computer/Technology Standards of Learning
Grades 3-5**

Basic operations and concepts

Students demonstrate an understanding of the nature and operation of technology systems.

C/T 3-5.1

- a) Discuss common uses of computers in their daily life and the advantages and disadvantages those uses provide.
- b) Communicate about basic technology components with appropriate terminology.

Students are proficient in the use of technology.

C/T 3-5.2

- a) Use skills and procedures needed to operate various technologies such as scanners, digital cameras and hand-held computers.
- b) Identify basic software applications such as word processing, databases, and spreadsheets.

Social, ethical, and human issues

Students understand the ethical, cultural, and societal issues related to technology.

C/T 3-5.3

- a) Identify how technology has changed society in areas such as communications, transportation, and the economy.
- b) Discuss ethical behaviors when using information and technology.

Students practice responsible use of technology systems, information, and software.

C/T 3-5.4

- a) Understand the need for the school division's acceptable use policy.
- b) Discuss the rationale of fair use and copyright regulations.
- c) Follow rules for personal safety when using the Internet.

Students develop positive attitudes towards technology uses that support lifelong learning, collaboration, personal pursuits, and productivity.

C/T 3-5.5

- a) Work collaboratively when using technology.
- b) Practice and communicate respect for people, equipment, and resources.
- c) Understand how technology expands opportunities for learning.

Technology research tools

Students use technology to locate, evaluate, and collect information from a variety of sources.

C/T 3-5.6

- a) Collect information from a variety of sources.
- b) Evaluate the accuracy of electronic information sources.
- c) Enter data into databases and spreadsheets.

Problem-solving and decision-making tools

Students use technology resources for solving problems and making informed decisions.

C/T 3-5.7

- a) Determine when technology tools are appropriate to solve a problem and make a decision.
- b) Select resources to solve problems and make informed decisions.

Technology communication tools

Students use a variety of media and formats to communicate information and ideas effectively to multiple audiences.

C/T 3-5.8

- a) Produce documents demonstrating the ability to edit, reformat, and integrate various software tools.
- b) Use technology tools for individual and collaborative writing, communication, and publishing activities.
- c) Use telecommunication tools to communicate and share information with others.

**Proposed
Computer/Technology Standards of Learning
Grades 6-8**

Basic operations and concepts

Students demonstrate an understanding of the nature and operation of technology systems.

C/T 6-8.1

- a) Describe how technology impacts learning.
- b) Explore how software and hardware are developed to respond to the changing needs of technology.
- c) Describe compatibility issues between various types of technology.

Students are proficient in the use of technology.

C/T6-8.2

- a) Understand that hardware and software have different operating systems that may affect their use.
- b) Use self-help features such as online tutorials and manuals to learn to use hardware and software.

Social, ethical, and human issues

Students understand the ethical, cultural, and societal issues related to technology.

C/T 6-8.3

- a) Demonstrate knowledge of current changes in information technologies.
- b) Explain the need for laws and policies to govern technology.
- c) Explore career opportunities in technology related careers.

Students practice responsible use of technology systems, information, and software.

C/T 6-8.4

- a) Demonstrate the correct use of fair use and copyright regulations.
- b) Demonstrate compliance with the school division's Acceptable Use Policy and other legal guidelines.

Students develop positive attitudes towards technology uses that support lifelong learning, collaboration, personal pursuits, and productivity.

C/T 6-8.5

- a) Work collaboratively and/or independently when using technology.
- b) Practice preventative maintenance of equipment, resources, and facilities.
- c) Explore the potential of the Internet as a means of personal learning and the respectful exchange of ideas and products.

Technology research tools

Students use technology to locate, evaluate, and collect information from a variety of sources.

C/T 6-8.6

- a) Use databases and spreadsheets to evaluate information.
- b) Use technology resources such as calculators and data collection probes for gathering information.
- c) Use Internet and other electronic resources to locate information in real time.

Students evaluate and select new information resources and technological innovations based on the appropriateness for specific tasks.

C/T 6-8.7

- a) Use search strategies to retrieve information.
- b) Evaluate the accuracy, relevance, and appropriateness of electronic information sources.

Problem-solving and decision-making tools

Students use technology resources for solving problems and making informed decisions.

C/T 6-8.8

- a) Employ technology in the development of strategies for solving problems.
- b) Use a variety of technologies to identify and provide possible solutions to real-world problems.
- c) Use content-specific tools, software, and simulations such as environmental probes, graphic calculators, exploratory environments, and web tools.
- d) Participate in collaborative problem-solving activities.
- e) Select and use appropriate tools and technology resources to accomplish a variety of tasks.

Technology communication tools

Students use a variety of media and formats to communicate information and ideas effectively to multiple audiences.

C/T 6-8.9

- a) Choose the appropriate tool, format, and style to communicate information.
- b) Independently use technology tools to create and communicate for individual and/or collaborative projects.
- c) Produce documents demonstrating the ability to edit, reformat, and integrate various software tools.

**Proposed
Computer/Technology Standards of Learning
Grades 9-12**

Basic operations and concepts

Students demonstrate an understanding of the nature and operation of technology systems.

C/T 9-12.1

- a) Discuss the inherent advantages and limitations of technology.
- b) Define the relationship between infrastructure, electronic resources, and connectivity.
- c) Identify and describe the impact of new and emerging technologies and their applications.

Students are proficient in the use of technology.

C/T 9-12.2

- a) Identify and resolve hardware and software compatibility issues.
- b) Develop and communicate strategies for solving routine hardware and software problems.

Social, ethical, and human issues

Students understand the ethical, cultural, and societal issues related to technology.

C/T 9-12.3

- a) Assess the potential of information and technology to address personal, lifelong learning, and workplace needs.
- b) Demonstrate knowledge of electronic crimes such as viruses, pirating, and computer hacking.
- c) Explore and participate in online communities, and online learning opportunities.
- d) Identify the role that technology will play in future career opportunities.

Students practice responsible use of technology systems, information, and software.

C/T 9-12.4

- a) Adhere to fair use and copyright guidelines.
- b) Adhere to the school division's Acceptable Use Policy as well as other state and federal laws.
- c) Model respect for intellectual property.

Students develop positive attitudes towards technology uses that support lifelong learning, collaboration, personal pursuits, and productivity.

C/T 9-12.5

- a) Respectfully collaborate with peers, experts, and others to contribute to an electronic community of learning.
- b) Model responsible use and respect for equipment, resources, and facilities.

Technology research tools

Students use technology to locate, evaluate, and collect information from a variety of sources.

C/T 9-12.6

- a) Integrate databases, spreadsheets, charts, and tables to create reports.
- b) Use available technological tools to expand and enhance understanding of ideas and concepts.

Students evaluate and select new information resources and technological innovations based on the appropriateness for specific tasks.

C/T 9-12.7

- a) Analyze and draw conclusions about the comprehensiveness and bias of electronic information sources.
- b) Design and implement a variety of search strategies to retrieve electronic information.

Problem-solving and decision-making tools

Students use technology resources for solving problems and making informed decisions.

C/T 9-12.8

- a) Investigate and apply expert systems, intelligent agents, and simulations in real-world situations.
- b) Select and apply technology tools for information analysis, problem-solving, and decision-making.
- c) Use technology resources such as educational software, simulations, and models for problem-solving, and independent learning.
- d) Produce and disseminate information through collaborative problem-solving activities.

Technology communication tools

Students use a variety of media and formats to communicate information and ideas effectively to multiple audiences.

C/T 9-12.9

- a) Determine the most effective tool, format, and style to communicate to specific audiences.
- b) Use technology-based options, including distance and distributed education, to collaborate, research, publish, and communicate.
- c) Practice self-directed use of advanced technology tools for communicating with specific audiences.